

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, 19-24, 26-28, and 36-43 are pending in the application. In the non-final Official Action dated January 16, 2007, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- I.) Rejected claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 20, 22, 27, and 36-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brereton, et al. (U.S. 6,128,612)* ("*Brereton*") in view of *LiVecchi (U.S. 6,427,161)*.
- II.) Rejected claims 2-3, 5, 7, 9-10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brereton* in view of *LiVecchi* and further in view of *Jordan (U.S. 2002/0069157)*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and address the Examiner's disposition below.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, 21, 22 and 28 have been amended.

- I.) Rejection of claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 20, 22, 27, and 36-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brereton, et al. (U.S. 6,128,612) ("Brereton") in view of LiVecchi (U.S. 6,427,161):

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to obtaining one or more of said client requests for hierarchically organized data at a server. The client requests are divided into one or more smaller units. Each of the smaller units are a transaction request serviceable by one of a plurality of worker threads, and include an envelope having a beginning tag and an ending tag that are recognizable by the respective worker threads. The smaller units are placed in a queue and serviced in order. The worker threads stop service of a respective smaller unit upon encountering an ending tag.

As described in Applicants' specification, Applicants' claimed subject matter relating to the inclusion of an ending tag allows a worker thread to know when to stop servicing the smaller unit. This is unlike conventional methods and systems, in which units do not include an envelope having an ending tag. In conventional methods and systems, a worker thread may stop servicing a unit before reaching the end of the unit, because the worker thread does not know where the end of the unit is and needs to start servicing another unit. (Specification, page 18, lines 4-19).

This is clearly unlike *Brereton* in view of *LiVecchi*, which fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed smaller units including an envelope and a worker object stopping service of

a respective smaller unit upon encountering an ending tag. *Brereton* discloses an ad-hoc query language in which query strings are parsed. Nowhere does *Brereton* disclose or suggest that its query strings include smaller units that have an envelope with a beginning tag and an ending tag that are recognizable by a respective worker threads. This subject matter is simply neither discussed nor suggested in *Brereton*. Accordingly, *Brereton* could not disclose nor suggest a worker object stopping service of a respective smaller unit upon encountering an ending tag.

LiVecchi also fails to disclose or suggest this claimed subject matter. *LiVecchi* discloses that requests are assigned to various threads for processing. Nowhere does *LiVecchi* disclose or suggest that its requests include smaller units that have an envelope with a beginning tag and an ending tag that are recognizable by a respective worker threads. This subject matter is simply neither discussed nor suggested in *LiVecchi*. Accordingly, *LiVecchi* could not disclose nor suggest a worker object stopping service of a respective smaller unit upon encountering an ending tag.

For at least these reasons, *Brereton* in view of *LiVecchi* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 8, 15, and 22.

Claims 6, 13, 20, and 27 depend from claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, respectively, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

- II.) Rejection of claims 2-3, 5, 7, 9-10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brereton in view of LiVecchi and further in view of Jordan (U.S. 2002/0069157):

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 are allowable over *Brereton* in view of *LiVecchi* as discussed above.

Jordan still fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed smaller units including an envelope and a worker object stopping service of a respective smaller unit upon encountering an ending tag. Instead, *Jordan* merely discloses that it uses XML as a mechanism for data exchange. *Jordan* [0217]. Nowhere does *Jordan* disclose or suggest that requests may include smaller units that have an envelope with a beginning tag and an ending tag that are recognizable by a respective worker threads. This subject matter is simply neither discussed nor suggested in *Jordan*. Accordingly, *Jordan* could not disclose nor suggest a worker object stopping service of a respective smaller unit upon encountering an ending tag.

Therefore, *Brereton* in view of *LiVecchi* and further in view of *Jordan* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 8, 15, and 22.

Claims 2-3, 5, 7, 9-10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, and 28 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 8, 15, or 22 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Christopher P. Rauch/

Christopher P. Rauch
Registration No. 45,034

Customer Number 58328
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Phone: (312) 876-8000
Fax: (312) 876-7934